DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 476 269 CS 510 831

AUTHOR	Dannels, Deanna; Jackson, Nancy; Robertson, Terry; Sheckles, Ted; Tomlinson, Stephanie
TITLE	Proceedings from the Communication Across the Curriculum Strand. NCA 2001 Summer Conference: Engaging 21st Century Communication Students.
INSTITUTION	National Communication Association, Annandale, VA.
PUB DATE	2001-06-00
NOTE	18p.; See CS 511 831-842 for other papers given at the summer conference.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.natcom.org/Instruction/summerconf/summerconf.htm.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Proceedings (021) -- Guides - Non-Classroom (055)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	College Instruction; *Communication (Thought Transfer); *Communication Skills; *Educational Practices; Higher Education; Program Administration; Program Content
IDENTIFIERS	*Communication Across the Curriculum; National Communication Association; Program Characteristics; Program Objectives; Questions

ABSTRACT

This Proceedings from the Communication across the Curriculum (CXC) strand of the National Communication Association's 2001 Summer Conference first highlights and describes five of the most common types of programs across the nation: Speaking Intensive Programs, Combined Speaking and Writing Programs, Discipline-Specific Programs, Faculty Development Programs, and Start-up Programs. The Proceedings next cites 7 questions about CXC programs which were asked of the conference's presenters and provides the answers given by the presenters--examples of questions are: What kind of funding does a new CXC program need?; What are some strategies for sustaining a CXC program?; and What are some strategies for assessing a CXC program? The Proceedings then presents 11 Guiding Principles for this topic which were developed at the conference and which represent recommendations of the conferees and planners--examples of principles are: CXC programs are grounded in communication theory and research and contribute to communication theory; CXC programs promote and reinforce effective communication strategies essential for students' academic, civic, and professional results; CXC programs enhance student learning in the content areas; and CXC programs develop clear procedures for the assessment and evaluation of class assignments, student outcomes, and the CXC program as a whole. Finally, the Proceedings outlines a series of action recommendations for CXC which were generated at the conference. (Contains 13 references.) (NKA)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 476 269

N C A
National Communication Association
founded 1914

1765 N. Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
202-464-4622
202-464-4600 (fax)

CXC

NCA 2001 Summer Conference

"Engaging 21st Century Communication Students"

Proceedings from the Communication Across the Curriculum Strand

Table of Contents

E-mail

Essential Facts

FAQ

Guiding Principles

Recommendations

Bibliography

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Morreale

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

E-mail

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CS 510 831

Deanna Dannels, North Carolina State University

deanna_dannels@ncsu.edu

Nancy Jackson, Clemson University

nancyj@clemson.edu

Terry Robertson, Columbia College

troberts@colacoll.edu

Ted Sheckles, Randolph-Macon College

tsheckel@rmc.edu

Stephanie Tomlinson, University of Washington

stomlins@u.washington.edu

Return to Top

Essential Facts

There are several types of communication across the curriculum programs across the nation. The five we are highlighting here represent the most common types of programs. Although we are describing them as five separate best practices, we want to reiterate that many programs include aspects from more than one of these best practices. Some programs are defined primarily by one or two of these best practices, but some have aspects of three or four of them. Consider these five types of programs, then, as potentially overlapping and complementary.

1. Speaking Intensive Programs

Speaking intensive programs are defined by an institutional labeling of courses as intensive (SI or CI). These programs often have a speaking intensive requirement as part of general education requirements. They typically incorporate faculty training for intensive courses, ongoing assessment of those courses, and some form of student support in a center or lab. Speaking intensive requirements are different across institutions, but typically include multiple, varied assignments and speaking opportunities.

2. Combined Speaking and Writing Programs

Combined speaking and writing programs are those that have teamed up with other initiatives on campus such as an ongoing or new writing-across-the curriculum (WAC) movement. They often have some central location outside of the communication or English department. It is likely, as well, that combined programs also focus on issues that connect speaking and writing—such as argument, reading, listening, and/or leadership.

3. Discipline-Specific Programs

Discipline-specific programs are defined primarily by their emphasis on the particular genres, instruction, and parameters that face one college or department. They are often not campus-wide, but focused on a particular

discipline. Instruction, training, and development of these programs is completed with continuous input of faculty from the "host" discipline. These programs range from large scale curricular revision to single course transformation.

4. **Faculty Development Programs**

Faculty development programs are defined primarily by their emphasis on training faculty to incorporate speaking in their courses to improve learning and communication competence. They range from individual workshops to on-going support and/or department-specific consulting. Faculty development programs often provide faculty with some form of support for involvement, and encourage collaboration among faculty who attend events.

5. **Start-up Programs**

Start-up programs are new cross-curricular programs that have been approved or have taken new form in the past couple of years. These programs are often fueled by wider university initiatives or needs and have received some form of start-up money or support. These programs range in size, support, and form but are characterized by their focus on growth and financial support.

Return to Top

FAQ

The following questions were asked of the presenters of this strand and answered as follows:

1. What kind of funding does a new CXC program need? What are some creative strategies to use if you don't get or have the ideal funding?

- The Randolph-Macon College program was funded fo two years of development by a $45,000 grant from a private foundation. The grant money was spent almos entirely on faculty development. After the grant ended program had to limp along on $1,000 per year. It was, again, almost entirely spent on faculty development. Serving on Oral Communication Council counts as "service." Speaking tutors (which we've used thus far very limited basis) are covered by the budget for the Higgins Academic Center. Since CXC will be a major component in new curriculum currently under consideration and since considerable money has been

pledged to develop and support this curriculum, the funding picture is bright for the future. How bright I'm n sure yet.

- Financial needs vary according to institution and type CXC program. Several programs utilize undergradua student tutors/lab assistances or graduate students as way to staff communication labs and/or create and implement workshops on a limited budget. Also, when possible, it may ease financial burdens to piggy back other campus initiatives.

- NC State has a hardened budged of $70,000 at the moment, which does not include salaries for directors time Director, ½ time Asst. Director, ¼ time Outcomes Director) or TA's (2 ½ time graduate students). This budget includes: supplies, faculty grants, seminar stipends, administrative assistance salary (1/2 time), travel, honoraria for external workshop leaders, equipment, and other miscellaneous items. Most of th budget is spent entirely on faculty development. The Undergraduate Tutorial Center will be providing a bud for student support services (12-month ¾ time coordin plus supplies and equipment). Money for other "luxur such as food (which cannot come out of the state bud is received by the deans of each college, in a contract agreement (we provide faculty development services, resources, etc.) and they given us $500 per year. Bud growth has been promised, but given current legislativ difficulties in NC and administrative changes, that grow is still unclear.

2. What are some examples of speaking to learn assignments?

   - I have file full of assignments from several other college but I hesitate to talk about courses elsewhere. So, first, me recommend that faculty interested in speaking inten courses contact DePauw University, Hamline University and Mary Washington College for further information ab courses. Here are some samples I can talk about: Biolo Senior Seminar - proposals presented orally and questioned; papers presented orally and questioned (w practice session provided); Philosophical Problems - en course discussion-based with opportunities to examine

discussion process; Sociological Theory - oral presentations on theorists; panel discussion on "issue" with panelists taking assigned theoretical perspectives; Psychology & Law – debates; Gender Issues in Communication - oral summaries of research articles; dramatizations; 45-min. seminars (with A-V and discussion as well as presentation of info); Non-Euclidean Geometry - small proof-writing groups; paired problem-solving.

- For a full list of 10 speaking to learn assignments, please email me at deanna_dannels@ncsu.edu. I'd be glad to send you an attachment with my resources.

3. What are some strategies for sustaining a CXC program?

- The crucial ingredient is making the CXC program part of the culture of the college/university. A way to do that is to make sure the program is multiply-owned. Also, make sure administrative support is such that, should an initial director leave/retire/whatever, he/she is immediately replaced by someone who has the expertise and the enthusiasm necessary to sustain the effort.

- (1) One of the most essential aspects is to establish interdisciplinary support for the program from the very beginning. If the program is seen as central and "owned" by more than one department, it is more difficult to eliminate it. (2) Increase visibility of the program across campus by continually "selling" the program and publicizing the benefits as well as the success stories. (3) Continually seek internal and external financial support. The biggest threat to CXC programs appears to be the reduction or elimination of money. (4) Hire an expert to design and direct the program. To do this, institutions need to make the positions attractive to be able to recruit top candidates.

- Create partnerships with other university initiatives so that the program becomes a critical part of the university culture and administration. Locate the program in a central place (not only in one department or college) and create enough structural footings so that the program becomes central in other administrative initiatives. For example, at NC State, we are located in the College of Humanities and Social

Sciences but have created partnerships in various initiatives with the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning, the University Office of Planning and Assessment, and the Committee on Program Review—as well as NSF proposals with two other Colleges (Engineering and Physical and Mathematical Sciences). Basically, become part of the fabric of the university.

4. How do you deal with internal resistance? (within the discipline).

   - The internal resistance seems to me to be tied to two ideas-that people outside of speech communication should not be teaching speech; and that, should this happen, jobs will be lost. I would respond, first, by establishing some principles: 1. That CXC should follow a basic course taught by a trained faculty member whenever possible; 2. That faculty following-up this basic course are teaching speech communication as it functions within their disciplines just as faculty in a WAC program follow-up a composition course by teaching writing as it functions within their disciplines; 3. When a basic course is not possible (as is the case at many smaller institutions), that the institution vest responsibility for program in someone with speech communication credentials and that the institution fund faculty development workshops and systematic consultation by that vested faculty member with his/her colleagues. Then, I'd ask communication colleagues to see a CXC program that is not following-up a basic course as an opportunity to evoke interest in the discipline on the part of students and colleagues. This interest can lead to the call for more communication coursework. Jobs can result, and these jobs can be better ones than teaching multiple sections of the basic course. I think communication faculty who totally reject such a program are not seizing this opportunity for the discipline.

   - First, determine where the resistance is coming from (identify specific individuals). Invite them to share their concerns. Be open to listening to them. Develop an individual relationship with him/her. Where possible, refer to research to help demonstrate how you are addressing their concerns. Use your rhetorical skills! Second, use others (besides the director) to help address concerns/threats. Also, it is important to make sure that the program is done right and is grounded in the SpCmu theory and research. If it isn't,

there is reason for concern and resistance.

- I see three points of internal resistance—1) faculty in other disciplines can't teach speech and it speaks poorly of our discipline to assume they can. To address this—continue to have a presence with faculty in other disciplines, this is an opportunity to illustrate the complexity of the discipline, not the simplicity of it. When they start learning, they'll want to know more and we can show them what a strong discipline we have. 2) CXC is a theoretical. To address this—simple-- publish, publish, publish—and start asking interesting scholarly questions and applying for grants that allow those questions to be explored. 3) CXC threatens the basic course. CXC provides a supplement to the basic course and allows a more discipline-specific perspective in working with other colleges. The ideal is to have both—although that ideal is not always possible. Without a basic course, a good CXC program needs someone directing it who has a strong communication background.

- How do you deal with external resistance? (faculty or students in other disciplines).

- Two principles need to be stressed with resisting "externals": that CXC is a speaking-to-learn movement as well as a skills-acquisition movement; that CXC, if it is to work, must deal with the oral communication demands and situations of THEIR disciplines. CXC's goal then is help students learn chemistry, etc. better and become more professionally-ready chemists, etc. It is also crucial to recognize that resisting "externals" often do not know what communication discipline does and have very negative stereotypes of the discipline in their minds. Therefore, it is crucial to expose these resisters to the breadth of the discipline and to its best research.

- Start by demonstrating how CXC can help to accomplish their already established goals. Draw upon research demonstrating the need for communication competence for professional and personal success. Identify interdisciplinary faculty who support the program and get them on-board in promoting the program (it is more persuasive to hear about it from a peer rather than someone whose "job" it is to sell the program). Finally, provide information to help minimize the mis-information that may be working against the success of the program.

- Meet them in their turf—validate their resistance and their concerns. Provide them with discipline-specific models that address their concerns. Also, collect samples of the ways in which faculty have dealt with these challenges. For example, we've collected "testimonials" from faculty who have answered "yeah, but" questions from their own perspective. We hand them out so that faculty who may have the same concerns can see their colleagues' responses. You won't get everyone—so don't be too upset if you get some resistance—collect a group of champions and work from there.

5. What are some strategies for assessing CXC programs?

   - Originally, we were going to use PRCA and CCAI in a pre- and post- design. That's when we thought FIPSE was going to be our funded. The private foundation wasn't as hung-up on using normed instruments, so we use a self-report questionnaire at the end of all SI courses. Video portfolios have a great deal of appeal to folks here, but the logistics of going that route, even at a small college, are mind-boggling.

   - We use discipline-specific outcomes based assessment cycle at NC State. With the Program's help, every department creates 1-2 page outcomes statements for graduating seniors in the areas of writing and speaking. Every department works out an individualized plan for achieving its outcomes. Plans include a "saturation" model for the curriculum, a writing/speaking-intensive model, a focus on senior capstone courses, etc. It also explains how faculty will engage in activities, with the help of the Program and other units, in support of the effort. To explain and document campus-wide progress, the Program develops "departmental portfolios" for each unit. These portfolios describe the cycle of outcomes, implementation, an assessment established in the department and shows every effort—departmental and individual—that supports the completion of the cycle, particularly in the area of implementation. With the help of the Program, every department works out one or more methods to gauge how well it has achieved or is achieving its outcomes. Focus includes students, alumni, employers, faculty, and others. Methods include portfolios, pre/post measures, surveys, etc.

6. To what extent is CXC transferable to a K12 or community college setting? Are there any examples of programs in

these settings?

- I would think CXC is very transferable to K-12, especially when speaking-to-learn is stressed. I'm not sure about the community college situation. CXC assumes that instruction and practice and evaluation over a four-year period produces results. I'm dubious that the same can be done over two, especially since the best SI courses I've seen have been in the majors. The community college may be a place where we want to insist much more strongly on the need for a basic course taught by someone thoroughly trained in the communication discipline.

- Although there is limited (if any) research of CXC program in these settings, I can't think of any reason that they couldn't be transferable. I'm sure that they would face some unique challenges, but I think the basic idea of CXC and the models utilized at colleges and universities would be a good starting point for implementing CXC in these contexts.

- I think it is transferable, taking into consideration the specific needs that face K-12 and Community Colleges.

7. What are some strategies for working with WAC folks?

    - Important fundamental principle is to insist on EQUALITY. For example, if WAC is directed by full-time tenure-track faculty member, so should CXC. Most WAC people I know will readily embrace the idea of equality, but they may have to be reminded. That is so because most WAC people are from English and some fierce prejudices against communication exist among English faculty. Note that I'm a PhD in English and in an English Dept: I know what I'm talking about from the inside of the discipline of English. Fortunately, most WAC people are composition people, who have long been victims of the prevailing literature-is-the-only-thing-that-is-important attitude in many English depts. Therefore, these WAC people can be jolted into accepting equality if you suggest that speech communication should not be marginalized by WAC in a way comparable to how composition was (and still is) marginalized by English. It is also important to be alert to the differences between speaking and writing and to note them. WAC people may well be so alert to the similarities that they are blind to important differences.

- In a truly integrated program, be sure the positions are equal and the directors integrate activities. Also, learn as much as possible about the WAC movement—to understand similarities and differences between it and the CXC movement. If you are co-directing a program—sponsor integrated workshops, seminars, and grants. Publish together, apply for grants together, and present a united front. If you are running parallel programs or are trying to start a CXC program where WAC already exists, see where the best "fits" exist, where resources can be shared, and where each of the programs can support each other.

Return to Top

Guiding Principles

The following Guiding Principles for this topic were developed at the summer conference. They represent recommendations of the conferees and planners of this strand topic. They are provided to inform engagement in the praxis of Communication across the Curriculum. However, they have not been reviewed and endorsed by NCA.

1. CXC programs are grounded in communication theory and research and contribute to communication scholarship.

2. CXC programs promote and reinforce effective communication strategies essential for students' academic, civic, and professional pursuits.

3. CXC programs' goals and objectives are grounded in the culture and mission of the institution.

4. CXC programs address and respond to the communication needs and outcomes of the disciplines.

5. CXC programs enhance student learning in the content areas.

6. CXC programs develop clear procedures for the assessment and evaluation of class assignments, student outcomes, and the CXC program as a whole.

7. CXC programs are led by faculty members with appropriate training in the communication discipline.

8. The work of CXC directors and staff is compensated,

evaluated, and considered a substantive part of review.

9. CXC programs incorporate initial and ongoing faculty development with incentives offered for participation.

10. CXC programs develop competence in various context of communication (e.g., interpersonal, small group, intercultural, and public speaking—to name a few).

11. CXC should be a supplement to a basic communication course taught by a faculty member trained in the communication discipline. However, where this is not possible, CXC should be directed by a faculty member trained in the communication discipline.

Return to Top

Recommendations

Summary of Action Recommendations (developed in Friday sessions)

1. **Speaking Intensive Programs**

   - Have explicit idea of goals
   - Make criteria for intensive courses clear
   - Feature multiple kinds of speaking
   - Feature multiple opportunities to speak
   - Evaluate courses on an on-going basis
   - Provide collegial support to instructors of intensive courses

2. **Speaking and Writing Programs**

   - Establish leadership from both disciplines
   - Integrate program activities and establish similar vision of "communication" competence

- Engage in collaborative research and external research grants
- Allow departments to define their own needs
- Create partnerships with higher level administrative activities

3. **Discipline-Specific Programs**

   - Ensure support of home and visited department
   - Know what is important and negotiable in course content and process
   - Be learner centered when coordinating with faculty
   - Learn as much as possible about host culture and values

   Consider ways to ensure sustainability and transferability

4. **Faculty Development Programs**

   - Work from participants' perspectives and disciplines
   - Achieve balance among theory, research, and practice
   - Incorporate external expertise, internal (comm.) expertise and peer expertise
   - Treat faculty development as ongoing process
   - Provide support for continuous participation by faculty

5. **Start-Up Programs**

   - Seek external/internal funding and resources
   - Piggy-back on other initiatives
   - Assess faculty and student participation
   - Get involvement and support from Communication

and interdisciplinary faculty

- Involve students as mentors
- Consult with other programs

Summary of Action Recommendations (developed in Saturday sessions)

1. **CXC Programs and Directors**

    - Create multidisciplinary advisory boards
    - Seek out partnerships
    - Continue ongoing assessment
    - Stay involved with the scholarship of the discipline
    - Seek internal and external funding
    - Promote program to campus, public, and community

2. **Institutions interested in CXC programs**

    - Recruit directors with communication background, ideally in instruction and/or pedagogy
    - Support development of directors
    - Support graduate work in CXC
    - Provide program needs (equipment, personnel, labs, travel)
    - Promote and market the CXC program
    - Consider administrative work of directors in evaluation procedures

3. **Communication Departments**

    - Support CXC programs/directors with time release, positive attitude, and marketing

- Attend some workshops to stay informed about movement and activities
- Provide assistance with workshops
- Promote and participate in assessment endeavors
- Consider CXC work as critical part of review and evaluation for directors

4. Other Departments

- Keep an open mind toward CXC endeavors
- Contribute expertise of faculty already incorporating communication in their classrooms
- Encourage faculty to innovate and re-energize teaching
- Provide some value to participation in CXC activitie

5. National Communication Association

- Finish CXC website
- Encourage special issues of journals devoted to CXC scholarship
- Feature CXC efforts in Spectra
- Consider CXC summer conference
- Consider CXC Commission
- Provide central database of programs and information of directors

Return to Top

Bibliography

The following were selected as essential reading and resources for anyone interested in engaging in the praxis of communication across the curriculum.

Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the

Research University. (1998). Reinventing undergraduate education: A blueprint for America's research universities. NY: State University of New York.

Cronin, M. W., & Glenn. P. (1991). Oral communication across the curriculum in higher education: The state of the art. Communication Education, 40, 356-367.

Cronin, M. W., & Grice, G. L. (1993). A comparative analysis of training models versus consulting/training models for implementing oral communication across the curriculum. Communication Education, 42, 1-8.

Cronin, M. W., Grice, G. L., & Palmerton, P. R. (2001). Oral communication across the curriculum: The state of the art after twenty-five years of experience. Journal of the Association for Communication Administration, 29, 66-87.

Dannels, D.P. (2001). Time to Speak Up: A theoretical framework of situated pedagogy and practice for communication across the curriculum. Communication Education, 50,144-158.

Morreale, S., Osborn, M., and Pearson, J. (2000). Why communication is important: A rationale for the centrality of the study of communication. Journal of the Association for Communication Administration, 29, 1-25.

Morreale, S., Shockley-Zalabak, P., & Whitney, P. (1993). The center for excellence in oral communication: Integrating communication across the curriculum. Communication Education, 42, 10-21.

Morello, J.T. (2000). Comparing speaking across the curriculum and writing across the curriculum programs. Communication Education, 49, (1) 99-113.

Palmerton, P. R. (1992). Teaching skills or teaching thinking? Journal of Applied Communications Research, 20, 334-341.

Powell, K. S., & Jankovich, J. L. (1997). An implementation model for a communication across the curriculum program. Business Communication Quarterly, 60, 9-19.

Sheckels, Theodore F. (1990) From writing across the curriculum to speaking across the curriculum: Advice on the pitfalls. Virginia Communication Journal, 19, 84-89.

Steinfatt, T. M. (1986). Communication across the

curriculum. Communication Quarterly, 34, 460-470.

Weiss, R. O. (1992). A decade of oral communication across the curriculum: An evaluation of the DePauw University oral communication program. Unpublished manuscript, DePauw University at Greencastle, IN.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

[X] This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

[ ] This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").